

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the outstanding Office Action in the above-identified patent application. Claims 1-10, 13-16, 22, 23 and 27-32 are allowed. Claims 11 and 25 have been amended.

Information Disclosure Statements were filed on January 12, 2005 and March 15, 2005. The Examiner is respectfully requested to review the art, initial the forms and return the initialed copies.

Claims 11-12, 17-20 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,513,377 (“*Capowski et al.*”) and Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (“*MPCD*”), offered as extrinsic evidence.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Capowski* and *MPCD*.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Capowski* and *MPCD* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0095838 (“*Li*”).

I. Rejection of Claims 11-12, 17-20 and 25-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 11-12, 17-20 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Capowski et al.* and *MPCD*.

As suggested by the Examiner in the “statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter” at page 8 of the Office Action, claim 11 has been amended to include “a re-timer to re-time data received from the first channel using a first clock signal and to retransmit the data to the second channel using a second clock signal.” At least this limitation is not taught or suggested by *Capowski et al.* and/or *MPCD*.

Claims 12 and 17-20 depend from claim 11 and therefore are patentable for at least similar reasons stated above in regard to claim 11.

As suggested by the Examiner in the “statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter” at page 8 of the Office Action, claim 25 has been amended to include “a re-timer to re-time data received from the primary channel using a first clock signal and to retransmit the data to the first stick channel using a second clock signal.” At least this limitation is not taught or suggested by *Capowski et al.* and/or *MPCD*.

Claim 26 depends from claim 25 and therefore is patentable for at least similar reasons stated above in regard to claim 25.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner stated that *Capowski et al.* and *MPCD* teach “bi-directional communication channels.” The Applicant’s attorney disagrees for at least the reasons

stated in the previous Response. However, in order to expedite prosecution, "bi-directional communication channels" has been replaced with the above Examiner suggested amendments to claims 11 and 25 in order to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, the deletion of "bi-directional communication channels" and previous related arguments in no way bind or affect the interpretation, infringement, validity and/or enforceability of any claim(s) or patent(s) resulting from, or relating to this application.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 11-12, 17-20 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

II. Rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Capowski* and *MPCD*.

Claim 21 depends from claim 11 and therefore is patentable for at least similar reasons stated above in regard to claim 11.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

III. Rejection of Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Capowski* and *MPCD* in view of *Li*.

Claim 24 depends from claim 11 and therefore is patentable for at least similar reasons stated above in regard to claim 11.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

IV. Comments on Statement of Reasons for the Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

In the Office Action, the Examiner provided reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter (hereinafter referred to as the "REASONS"). Applicants believe that the REASONS, to the extent understood, may be misconstrued and, as such, are incomplete. Applicants submit that indeed, the claims of the instant application, individually or in combination with other claims (via dependency), describe the patentable subject matter of Applicants' invention(s). Accordingly, the REASONS in no way bind or affect the interpretation, infringement, validity and/or enforceability of any claim(s) or patent(s) resulting from, or relating to this application.

V. Conclusion

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 11-12, 17-21 and 24-26 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 21, 2005

By:


Kirk J. DeNiro
Reg. No. 35,854

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 Market Street, Suite 540
San Francisco, CA 94105-4206
Telephone: (415) 369-9660
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665